DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 270 219 PS 015 851

AUTHOR Marshall, Hermine H.
TITLE Games Teachers and Students Play: An Analysis of Motivation in Three Fifth Grade Classrooms.
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (70th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Communication; Classroom Observation Techniques; Classroom Research; Comparative Analysis; Elementary Education; *Elementary School Students; Grade 5; *Student Motivation; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Responsibility

ABSTRACT

Motivational strategies and attitudes toward learning were examined among students in three fifth-grade classrooms. Teacher statements used to frame lessons, maintain the session and keep students on task, and handle responsibility for learning were extracted from transcripts of classroom observations. Lesson framing and management/maintenance statements were coded. Results suggested the operation of three different "games" in the classrooms. In the "Learning Game" classroom, twice as many lessons were introduced with motivational statements, as compared with the "Work Avoidance" and "Blame the Students" classrooms. More lessons in the "Learning Game" classroom than in the other two included positive motivational statements referring to intrinsic rather than extrinsic factors. Almost half of the management/maintenance statements in the "Learning Game" classroom were used to maintain student interest rather than to redirect students from off-task behavior. Neither of the teachers in the other two classrooms used these strategies. In the "Work Avoidance" classroom, students were not held responsible for incomplete work. In the "Blame the Students" classroom, the teacher did not see herself as responsible for poor performance. Results are discussed in terms of student motivation to learn and the importance of viewing the classrom as a learning setting rather than a work setting. (Author/RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED270219

Games Teachers and Students Play:

An Analysis of Motivation in Three Fifth Grade Classrooms

Hermine H. Marshall

San Francisco State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Hermine H. Marshall
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April, 1986.

Appreciation is expressed to Rhona S. Weinstein, principal investigator, for permission to use the data from an earlier study (Weinstein & Marshall, 1984) in the analyses presented here. The data were collected with a grant from the National Institute of Education (Grant G-80-0071) to Rhona S. Weinstein, principal investigator, with Hermine H. Marshall, senior research collaborator. The opinions expresssed here do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of these agencies and no official endorsement should be inferred.

Acknowledgement and thanks are also due to Marilyn Little and Yu Wen Ying for help in data collection, to Barbara Hutchison for help in coding, and to Janet Ford for help in data analysis. Gratitude is also expressed to the teachers, students, and administrators for their cooperation and participation in this study.

PS 015851

Games Teachers and Students Play: Motivation in Three Fifth Grade Classrooms

Hermine H. Marshall

Abstract

Motivational strategies and attitudes towards learning are examined in three fifth grade classrooms. Teacher statements used to (a) frame lessons, (b) maintain the lesson and keep students on task, and (c) handle responsibility for learning were extracted from transcripts of classroom observations. Lesson framing and management/maintenance statements were coded. Results suggest the operation of three different "games". In the "Learning Game" classroom, twice as many lessons were introduced with motivational statements compared to the "Work Avoidance" and "Blame the Students" classrooms. More lessons in the "Learning Game" classroom than the other two classrooms included positive motivational statements referring to intrinsic rather than extrinsic factors. Almost half of the management/maintenance statements in the "Learning Game" classroom were used to maintain student interest, rather than to redirect students from off-task behavior. Neither of the other teachers used these strategies. In the "Work Avoidance" classroom, students were not held responsible for incomplete work. In the "Blame the Students" classroom, the teacher did not see herself as responsible for poor performance. Results are discussed in terms of "student motivation to learn" and the importance of viewing the classroom as a learning setting rather than a work setting.

Research on motivation in school has often centered on the incentive component of motivation and thus on external rewards for achievement (Cf. Doyle, 1979). Contributions to understanding motivation in the classroom have also been made from research on the attributions that students give for their success and failure in achievement-related settings (e.g. Weiner, 1979). Two conceptions of motivation that diverge from this emphasis on achievement outcomes and their causes are those of "intrinsic motivation" (e.g. Deci, 1975) and "continuing motivation" (Maehr 1976). "Continuing motivation" is driven by a continuing interest in the task beyond the immediate setting, rather than by external sources of reinforcement for achievement. It differs from "intrinsic motivation" in that it is centrally rather than incidentally concerned with motivation as an educational outcome. In arguing for optimum student motivation as a justifiable educational goal, Nicholls (1979) points out that "endogenous attribution," wherein an action or behavior is perceived as an end in itself--rather than as a means to gain external rewards--may mediate task-intrinsic interest and consequently continued learning. Further, continued motivation to engage in learning activities has been found to be enhanced by a degree of student responsibility for learning--under appropriate conditions (Thomas, 1980).

In a similar vein, Brophy has recently highlighted the importance of motivating students "to learn rather than merely to perform" (italics in original, 1983, p. 201). His conception of "motivation to learn" underscores the value of learning and mastery rather than expectancy for success. Classroom tasks are seen as meaningful and worthwhile, regardless of whether they are intrinsically interesting. The emphasis is on valuing the process of learning rather than on meeting standards of excellence as is the case with achievement motivation.

Using a somewhat different framework, Ames and Ames (1984) describe three types of student and teacher motivational systems: (a)"ability-evaluative", (b)"task mastery", and (c)"moral responsibility." They postulate that these three systems are linked to three different goal structures: (a) competitive, (b) individualistic, and (c) cooperative. Their notion of a task mastery system linked to a noncompetitive individualistic goal structure seems to come close to Brohpy's conception of motivation to learn. They cite research to show that in these settings, students are focused on mastering the task and on exerting effort to this end rather than on comparing ability and competing for external rewards.

Relationships between differing goal structures and student achievement outcomes have been explored (e.g. Ames & Ames, 1984; Marshall & Weinstein, 1984a; Johnson, Johnson, & Scott, 1978; Slavin, 1977). However, little research is available concerning other classroom factors that specifically affect student motivation to learn. Brophy, Rohrkemper, Rashid, and Goldberg (1983) have begun to investigate the relationship between (a) expectations expressed in statements made by teachers to frame or present their lessons and (b) student motivation as measured by the level of student task engagement. Contrary to their hypotheses, student engagement was higher when teachers launched directly into the task than when teachers began with "presentation" statements. They suggest that teachers' planned attempts at motivation may occur only when they anticipate problems.

In reviewing transcripts of classroom observations from an earlier study (Marshall & Weinstein, 1984b; Weinstein & Marshall, 1984), several distinct modes of teacher-student operation that reflect differences in attitudes towards motivation and learning became apparent. In Classroom G, the students seemed to be playing a game that might be called "Let's see how much we can get away with" or "The Work-Avoidance Game." (This game is not uncommon in classrooms where there is a clash between school and the student culture in which primary interest is in socializing [Cf. Doyle, 1986]). The students in this classroom seemed to have developed ways of not doing work. Reciprocally, many of the teacher's strategies, such as accepting incomplete work, seemed inadvertently to perpetuate the game of minimal learning. Quite different attitudes were evident in Classroom I where the teacher seemed to be trying to show the observer that it was not her fault if the students in her class were not learning. Her game seemed to be "See how slow these students are" or "The Blame the Students Game." In contrast to both of these classrooms, Teacher K focused on motivating her students to learn. The game she initiated and which the students seemed to enjoy playing might be called "Learning is fun and a challenge" or simply "The Learning Game."

This article examines more systematically some of the motivational strategies and attitudes towards learning that were found in these three fifth grade classrooms. This study goes beyond the Brophy et al. (1983) investigation in considering a broader range of strategies which may contribute to motivation to learn than lesson framing statements alone. To explore the bases for differences in motivation between classrooms, teacher statements used to (a) frame lessons, (b) maintain the lesson and keep students on task, and (c) handle responsibility for learning are analyzed.

Method

Subjects

Three of the 4 fifth grade classrooms (out of the original 12 first, third and fifth grade clasrooms) in an urban multi-ethnic district that participated in our earlier study (Marshall & Weinstein, 1984b; Weinstein & Marshall, 1984) were examined. The individualized nature of instruction and private mode of communication (so that the observer was unable to hear much of the instruction) in the fourth Grade 5 classroom precluded adequate analysis of these strategies in this classroom.

Measures

Classroom observation methods. Trained observers used the Classroom Dimensions Observation System (Marshall & Weinstein, 1982) to make a narrative record of events in the classroom. These records focus on: (a) structure of the tasks, subject matter and materials, (b) grouping practices, (c) locus of responsibility in learning, (d) feedback and evaluation, (e) motivation, (f) quality of teacher-student relationship, and (g) expectation statements.

Observers undertook extensive training over a period of eleven weeks. As a check on inter-observer agreement, the transcripts of the field notes during training were inspected for correspondence of events between observers.

Teacher measures. Teachers were interviewed to clarify the classroom observations. Open-ended interview questions centered on locus of

responsibility (student or teacher), conceptualization of students' abilities, and effective teaching strategies for high and low achievers. Teachers were also asked in an open-ended manner to describe the students whom they had ranked highest and lowest in expectations for year-end reading.

Procedures

Three trained observers observed in one classroom at a time over a period of two to four weeks. Preliminary observations were made to acclimate the observer and the students. After these initial observations, at least 12 additional hours of observations per classroom were made in an attempt to observe three periods during which high and low reading groups received instruction, three math lessons, and some whole class discussion or organizational time. The content of the observations during the remainder of the time varied according to the type of activity common to the particular classroom.

Observers made a running record of events in the classroom, focusing on the teacher and the students with whom the teacher interacted. Teacher statements other than subject matter content were recorded as closely to verbatim as possible. The observer also made separate notes of impressions and interpretations of events. Field notes were typed immediately according to a format for ease of retrieval of teacher statements. After the observations in each classroom, the observer interviewed the teacher. Interviews were audiotaped and transcribed.

Data Analyses

All statements from the transcripts for the three classrooms were recorded (with page and line number) that were used to (a) frame lessons, (b) maintain or refocus students' attention on the task after the lesson began--including additional motivating statements--and (c) encourage or discourage responsibility for learning. The transcripts were read a second time several months later to retrieve any statements that had been missed on the first reading.

Lesson framing statements were put into categories based in part on those used by Brophy, et al. (1983). New categories were added to capture other statements from this set of classrooms. (Categories are listed in the appendix[1].) Each lesson was coded for the presence or absence of each of the lesson framing categories. Because each category used was coded as present for a given lesson introduction, multiple codes occurred where more than one type of motivational statement was used to frame the lesson. However, even if a category was mentioned more than once during the lesson introduction, it was recorded only once. To code management/maintenance statements during the lessons, categories were derived from the data and similar procedures were used. Each management/maintenance statement was coded for the presence or absence of each of the categoires. However, statements encouraging or discouraging responsibility for learning occurred too infrequently for this type of procedure. Instead, differences among the teachers' methods for handling responsibility are described qualitatively. Attribution statements

---

[1] Appendix is available from the author.

retrieved in the earlier study, teacher interview transcripts, and observers' field notes were also inspected for further explanatory clues.

Lesson framing and management/maintenance statements were coded independently by two trained coders. Inter-rater agreement was .90. All disagreements were resolved by discussion.

Two types of proportional variables were created. First, to ascertain the proportion of lessons for which each type of lesson framing statements was used, the number of lesson framing statements in each category was divided by the total number of lessons. Second, to determine the relative frequency with which each type of management/maintenance statement was used, the number of statements in each category was divided by the total number of management/maintenance statements. To test for equality of the proportion of statements across teachers, a series of contrasts (associated with the Chi Square Test of Homogeneity) were performed (Marascuilo & McSweeney, 1977). Since each of these groups of contrasts represents "families" of hypotheses, a family-wise error rate of .05 was used.

Results

Lesson Framing Statements

Analysis of the lesson framing statements revealed some striking differences between classrooms, as displayed in Table 1. Only 32% of the lessons in Classroom K, the Learning Game classroom, were introduced with no motivational statements in contrast to 69% of the lessons in Classroom G, the Work-Avoidance classroom, ($z = -3.19$) and 59% of the lessons in Classroom I, the Blame the Students classroom, ($z = -2.07$, n.s.). In Classrooms G and I, the students were asked to begin the task with statements such as "Open your books to page 382" or "It's reading time, so let's go." "All right. Quickly, let's correct the left hand side of the paper."

Even more revealing than the sheer difference in percent of lessons that included motivational statements were the types of statements used by these three teachers as reasons for students to engage in tasks. For Teacher G, an additional 13% of the lessons beyond the 69% that did not include motivational statements were stated solely as teacher demands, such as "I want you to do the following"--without other motivational cues. Six percent of the lessons referred to accountability, such as tests. Ten percent of the lesson introductions mentioned other external categories of accountability, time, challenge (standards), rewards or threats. In fact, 90%[2] of the lessons in Classroom G were introduced with either no motivational statements or with exogenous attributions. Only 13% of the lessons included positive motivational statements, such as mind, choice.

For Teacher I, the largest proportion of motivational statements were those referring to accountability (15%), such as "The test will be on Thursday." Combining the external categories of accountability, time, demands,

---

[2] This figure was arrived at by counting the lessons where either None, Demand, Accountability and other external categories were used. The percent of statements in these categories actually adds up to more than 90% since lesson introductions could include more than one type of lesson framing statement.

rewards and threats indicates that 26% of Teacher I's lessons incorporated motivational statements that referred to external sources. Continuity with prior lessons was mentioned in 11% of the lessons. Teacher I also occasionally referred to task ease or difficulty, to effort, and to the purpose of the lesson. Only 11% of the lessons were found to have statements that referred to positive motivation, such as choice.

In contrast, Teacher K's emphasis on learning as fun and a challenge is clear. The most common type of motivational statements used (in 29% of the lessons) were those of challenging students to use their minds, such as "Get your brain started. ... You're going to think" or "I want quality, creativity. ... Maybe I can learn something from you." In addition, 23% of the lessons could be categorized as fun, game-like, or incorporating humor. These lessons included math games and grammar lessons with humorous sentences. Nineteen percent of the lesson introductions were related to students' interests (personal relevance), such as cafeteria problems or selling girl scout cookies. Thus, 55% of the lessons in Classroom K included positive motivational statements, often referring to intrinsic/endogenous rather than extrinsic/exogenous factors, compared to 13% in Classroom G ($z = 4.27$) and 11% in Classroom I ($z = 3.86$). Also mentioned occasionally by this teacher were the teacher's interest in student opinions, positive expectations for completing the work, the teacher's own enthusiasm for the task, and the teacher's own personal experience related to the task. Ten percent included statements of continuity with previous lessons. Only 10% of the lesson introductions referred to external pressures of accountability, time, rewards or threat--and one of the references to accountability was to student concern with doing well. The differences between classrooms in the frequency of external sources were not statistically significant.

Management/Maintenance Statements

The pattern of statements used to maintain student motivation and on-task behavior after initiation of the lesson is shown in Table 2. Statements used for these purposes support the learning game being played in Classroom K. Teacher K used motivational statements of challenge e.g. "I'm going to trick you", "I challenge you..." throughout many lessons to keep students focused on the task. In fact, 36% of her management/maintenance statements were of this type. An additional 12% of her management/maintenance statements alerted students to attend, e.g. "Look bright-eyed and bushy-tailed," "Get your mind started." Thus, at least 48% of the management/maintenance statements made during the lesson were used to maintain student interest and attention, rather than to redirect it from off-task behavior. Neither of the other teachers were observed to use the strategy of alerting students to attend and only rarely challenged students to think.

In examining strategies used for returning students' attention to the task, Teacher K displayed a much lower percent of redirection with a negative tone, criticism, or threat to total number of redirection statements (5%) compared to Teacher G (28%, $z = -2.74$) or Teacher I (58%, $z = -6.72$). [Teacher I used redirection with a negative tone more frequently than Teacher G ($z = 4.57$).] Examination of statements used by Teacher K both to maintain attention as well as to return students' attention to the task indicates a higher percentage of positive strategies to total number of management/motivation statements (53%) compared to Teacher G (5%, $z = 8.49$) and Teacher I (9%, $z = 7.41$).

Responsibility for Learning

Teacher G's role in the Work-Avoidance game was apparent in her attitude towards incomplete and incorrect work. Failure of students to have completed assignments was observed on several occasions. Teacher G appeared to accept this lack of completed work. For example, when most of the math group did not have their homework, she simply wrote the problems on the board for the students to copy and do before recess. No comment was made regarding student responsibility for completing work on time. On another occasion, she told the students who still had not completed work that they were supposed to have finished the preceding day to "Get to work on it" in a matter-of-fact manner.

In contrast to Teacher G, Teacher I did not let students get away with not having their assignments prepared. She had one student call home for a parent to bring in his homework. To another student who refused to do his work, she firmly stated, "Yes you are. It is not a question of not doing it." Teacher I also used threats, e.g. "bench time at recess" or "you get a call home" for students who were not working. However, Teacher I was observed on a number of occasions to respond for students, without allowing them adequate opportunity to respond. Threats to inform parents and the teacher's responding for students may undercut students' sense of responsibility for learning. (See Marshall & Weinstein, 1985.)

The incidence of incomplete work in Classroom K was rare. On only one occasion were students observed not having a completed assignment. In this case, the student took responsibilty and asked, "If I forgot, can I go to my seat and do it?" The teacher permitted this action. Teacher K was also observed to encourage student responsibility for learning, for example in evaluating their own work. (See Marshall & Weintein, 1985.)

Discussion

In contrast to the Brohpy et al. study (1983) which examined a single type of teaching behavior, that of lesson presentation statements, the larger set of strategies included in this study sheds greater light on the configuration of teaching behaviors which are likely to contribute to student motivation to learn. These strategies include teaching behaviors which maintain or refocus attention during the lesson and which influence student responsibility for learning--in addition to lesson framing strategies.

The lesson framing statements, the management/maintenance statements, and the attitude towards responsibility for assignments and learning demonstrate clear differences in the motivational strategies used in these three classrooms. In Classroom G, these strategies and attitudes suggest how the teacher inadvertently contributes to the students' avoidance of learning. Most of the lessons were introduced with no motivational statements and only once was a motivational statement used during lessons or work periods. When students were not attending, redirection statements alone or with the cause stated and redirection with a negative tone, criticism or threat accounted for high proportions of statements to get students to return to the task at hand. Few positive strategies were used for this purpose. Moreover, Teacher G's acceptance of students' lack of preparedness may have given further impetus to the game of work avoidance. Inspection of the transcripts indicates that these strategies to engage students in the task were not very effective. The observers' notes frequently indicated that students were still wandering or

that the class was still noisy after the teacher had asked them to quiet down. In addition, some students exhibited open defiance of the teacher's attempts at redirecting students towards learning. For example, one student continued drumming his fingers after Teacher G signalled for him to stop. When one student was told he would have to miss recess for talking, he replied that he wasn't talking, just laughing. Motivational strategies were thus rather meager and ineffective in this classroom.

In Classroom I, the teacher appears to try her best to get the students to do their work, attend, and get their work finished. Motivation to complete work in this classroom appears imposed by external sources of teacher authority and threat. But the motivation is to do "work" without the emphasis on learning per se found in Classroom K. Less than half of the lessons included motivational statements, with about one quarter of the lessons referring to external sources of motivation. Most of the statements to redirect students' attention to the task included a negative tone, criticism or threat. Students were not allowed to get away with lack of work. However, Teacher I's responding for students may have negated other apparent attempts to encourage student responsibility for their work (Marshall & Weinstein, 1984a). Furthermore, inspection of the transcripts reveals that students are sometimes labeled as lazy or having poor work habits. The cause of poor performance spontaneously given to the observer in the presence of the students by Teacher I were negative characteristics of students. Poor performance was also attributed to previous teachers who did not teach certain prerequisite skills. In Teacher I's eyes, she was not to blame if the students don't learn. Like Teacher G, she did not seem to recognize her responsibility in motivating students to learn.

In contrast, most of the lessons in Classroom K were framed with motivational statements. Attributions for engaging in activities particularly emphasized the challenge and enjoyment of learning. This challenge to learn and the teacher's constant alertness to student on-task behavior continued throughout the lessons. Unlike some teachers who may deliberately use motivational devices in their lesson introductions only when they expect problems (Brophy et al., 1983), motivational strategies are an integral part of Teacher K's teaching. Positive motivating statements were seen to pervade the entire lesson, not just the introduction. Where redirection was necessary, it more often incorporated positive strategies supporting the student's ability to attend and participate in the learning activity. Students were made to feel that they could learn. If they forgot their homework, it was they who took the responsiblity. They took on the challenge of the game of learning. Interestingly, in contrast to Classroom G where the game was to avoid work, the students in Classroom K were observed on several occasions to ask for more work. The Learning Game appeared to work.

In comparing the presentation statements of these three teachers to the six teachers in the Brophy et al. (1983) study, several differences are apparent. First, the percentages of lessons with no framing statements for the teachers in the Brophy et al. study ranged from 5% to 46% with an average of 30%; whereas the range for these three teachers was 32% to 69%. Second, two of the most frequently used categories in the Brophy et al. study of cues positive expectations and cues effort were infrequently used and the third frequently used category of cues negative expectations was not used by these three teachers. Third, these teachers used statements which could not be

classified according to the original categories, thus requiring the construction of additional categories.

One factor that may account for the differences in the percentage of no framing statements and in the different categories used may be subject matter differences. Only math and reading lessons were observed in the Brophy et al. investigation, whereas a broader range of lessons was observed in the current study. Although there were slight grade level differences between the two studies in that the Brophy et al. study included two teachers each at Grades 4, 5, and 6, the effect of these differences was probably minimal.

Brophy and Kher (in press) conclude that not much motivation to learn has been observed because teachers fail to develop such motivation. Two of the three teachers in this study support these conclusions. However, Classroom K seems to reflect in many respects a prime example of a classroom where Brophy's concept of "motivation to learn" would be exhibited by the students.

Several factors may explain why motivation to learn and strategies to foster this type of motivation seem so rare. First, some researchers have suggested that academic work is "proceduralized" to reduce management demands (Doyle, 1986). That is, in many classrooms, instruction consists mainly of giving directions for completing worksheets and the worksheets themselves consist mainly of practice.

The second factor is related to the popular conception among both teachers and researchers that the classroom is a work setting--to the neglect of differences that make the classroom a "learning setting." Teachers frequently are heard to admonish their students "to get to work." For example, students in Classroom I were told to "get their work done so they could go out to recess." Educational researchers, such as Bossert (1979), Cohen, Intili, and Robbins (1979), and Doyle (1979), have utilized the analogy to industrial settings to analyze factors within the classroom, such as motivation, teacher control, and social relationships. For example, since "work" may not necessarily be satisfying for its own sake, rewards (pay or by analogy grades, praise, privileges, etc.) are necessary for work to be completed. Brophy's (1983) article on student motivation to learn, too, points out that "classrooms are work settings" (p. 201) as differentiated from play or recreation settings. Descriptions of classrooms as work places where completed tasks are exchanged for grades (Doyle, 1979) may indeed depict many classrooms as they are. However, focus on this conception may serve to inhibit the generation and growth of other conceptualizations that may be more conducive to the development of motivation to learn. For motivation to learn to become more prevalent, more effort needs to be made in locating, describing, and learning how to implement classrooms like Classroom K, where the emphasis is on learning rather than just on work.

A third reason for the apparent infrequent incidence of classrooms which emphasize student motivation to learn may be related to teachers' beliefs about the nature of ability and about their own efficacy in helping students learn. (Cf. Marshall & Weinstein, 1984a.) Some teachers believe that ability is a fixed entity and cannot be increased; whereas others believe that ability is multidimensional and incremental and therefore that teachers can have an effect in expanding students' abilities. (Cf. Dweck & Elliott, 1983; Rosenholtz & Cohen, 1983; Rosenholtz & Simpson, 1984.) For teachers who believe that ability can be increased, one method of accomplishing this is by

influencing students' motivation to learn. The role of these three teachers in motivation and their attitudes towards student ability are evident in the games played in these three classrooms. Playing Work-Avoidance and Blame the Student allows teachers to abdicate responsibility for motivating students and avoid facing the adequacy or inadequacy of their repertoire of strategies for helping. Evidence of these attitudes towards ability and motivation also emerges in the teacher interviews. For example, Teacher K stated her belief that even many of the low achievers have ability but are held back by a lack of self-direction. She was attempting "to get them motivated enough that they want to" (Marshall & Weinstein, 1985). She seemed to recognize the importance of self-management in continuing motivation pointed out by Thomas (1980). Like teachers in the noncompetitive individualistic goal structures described by Ames and Ames (1984), she was acting to maximize student competence and was concerned with how to accomplish educational goals. In contrast, neither Teacher I nor Teacher G seemed to see themselves responsible in the same way for the failure of some students to learn. Although Teacher I would not let students get away with not working and relied on external sources of reinforcement for task performance, she seemed to remove herself from responsibility for certain students. For example, she stated that one low achiever with a reading problem had a good oral vocabulary and that a part of his inability to perform was his attitude. Nevertheless, she felt that he needed about "two hours a day in a special learning problem class," but did not express any steps she would take to help him. She was more similar to teachers in classrooms with competitive goal structures who are likely to try to protect their own self-esteem--often by blaming the student for negative outcomes and taking credit for positive ones (Ames & Ames, 1984). In the interview, Teacher G stated that about half the class lacked motivation and probably did not have parents who really took an interest in them. In contrast to Teacher K, neither of these teachers appeared to have a high degree of personal teaching efficacy (Gibson & Dembo, 1984).

Finally, the lack of evidence of student motivation to learn may be due in part to a lack of recognition of this concept in teacher education programs, coupled with an emphasis on rewards as motivators and on achievement, rather than continuing motivation to learn, as an educational outcome.

Conclusions

The evidence presented here uncovers positive motivational strategies, beyond the lesson introduction strategies reported by Brophy et al. (1983), that encompass strategies which occur throughout the lesson. Moreover, the strategies used by Teacher K which appear to encourage "motivation to learn" may be useful as examples for teachers attempting to develop this type of motivation in their own classrooms. Teacher K's lesson framing strategies included challenging students to think and not be tricked, tying the topic to students' interest, teacher's own interest and enthusiasm, and lessons which are fun or contain humor. Management/maintenance strategies used throughout the lesson reflected what Kounin (1970) has termed "group alerting cues," again challenging students to use their minds, reminding students that they may be called on next, as well as relating the lesson to students' interests. In addition, strategies which encourage students to take responsibility for their own learning and to evaluate their learning were utilized to support student motivation to learn. Nevertheless, teachers' sense of teaching

efficacy and beliefs in students' ability to learn may be critical underlying factors.

References

Ames, C., & Ames, R. (1984). Systems of student and teacher motivation: Toward a qualitative definition. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 535-558.

Bossert, S. (1979). Tasks and social relationships in classrooms. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brophy, J. (1983). Conceptualizing student motivation. Educational Psychologist, 18, 200-215.

Brophy, J., & Kher, N. (in press). Teacher socialization as a mechanism for developing student motivation to learn. In R. Feldman (Ed.), Social Psychology Applied to Education. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brophy, J., Rohrkemper, M., Rashid, H., & Goldberger, M. (1983). Relationships between teachers' presentations of classroom tasks and students' engagement in those tasks. Journal of Educational Psychology, 75, 544-552.

Cohen, E. G., Intili, J. K., and Robbins, S. H. (1979). Task and authority: A sociological view of classroom management. In D. Duke (Ed.), Classroom management, Seventy-eighth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Deci, E. L. (1975). Intrinsic motivation. New York: Plenum Press.

Doyle, W. (1979). Classroom tasks and students' abilities. In P. Peterson & H. Walberg (Eds.), Research on Teaching: Concepts, findings, and implications. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Co.

Doyle, W. (1986). Classroom organization and managment. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Dweck, C. S., & Elliott, E. S. (1983). Achievement motivation. In P. Mussen & E. M. Hetherington (Eds.), Handbook of child psychology, IV: Socialization, personality and social development.

Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. H. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 569-582.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Scott, L. (1978). The effects of cooperative and individualized instruction in student attitudes and achievement. Journal of Social Psychology, 104, 207-217.

Kounin, J. S. (1970). Discipline and Group Management in Classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Marascuilo, L. A. & McSweeney, M. (1977). Nonparametric and distribution-free methods for the social sciences. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Marshall, H. H. & Weinstein, R. S. (1982). Classroom dimensions observation system: Manual. Berkeley, CA: Psychology Department, University of California.

Marshall, H. H. & Weinstein, R. S. (1984a). Classroom factors affecting students' self-evaluations: An interactional model. Review of Educational Research, 54, 301-325.

Marshall, H. H. & Weinstein, R. S. (1984b). Classrooms where students perceive high and low amounts of differential teacher treatment. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Marshall, H. H. & Weinstein, R. S. (1985). "It's not how much brains you've got, it's how you use it:" A comparison of classrooms expected to enhance or undermine students' self-evaluations. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Maehr, M. L. (1976). Continuing motivation: An analysis of a seldom considered educational outcome. Review of Educational Research, 46, 443-462.

Nicholls, J. (1979). Quality and equality in intellectual development: The role of motivation in education. American Psychologist, 34, 1071-1084.

Rosenholtz, S. J. & Cohen, E. G. (1983). Back to basics and the desegregated classroom. Elementary School Journal, 5, 515-527.

Rosenholtz, S. J. & Simpson, C. (1984). The formation of ability conceptions: Developmental trend or social construction: Review of Educational Research, 54, 31-64.

Slavin, R. (1980). Cooperative learning. Review of Educational Research, 50, 315-342.

Thomas, J. W. (1980). Agency and achievement: Self-managment and self-regard. Review of Educational Research, 50, 213-240.

Weiner, B. (1979). A theory of motivation for some classroom experiences. Journal of Educational Psychology, 71, 3-25.

Weinstein, R. S., & Marshall, H. H. (1984). Ecology of students' achievement expectations: Final report. Berkeley, CA: Psychology Department, University of California.

Table 1

Number and Percent of Lesson Framing Statements

	Teacher K		Teacher G		Teacher I	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Lessons	31		48		27	
Statements	51		58		37	
None	10	32	33	69	16	59
Demand	0	0	6	13	1	4
Mind	9	29	3	6	0	0
Fun/Game/Humor	7	23	0	0	0	0
Personal Relev.	6	19	0	0	1	4
Accountability	2	7	3	6	4	15
Continuity	3	10	2	5	3	11
Time Reminder	2	7	1	2	3	11
Other	12		10		9	
Total Positive*	17	55	6	13	3	11
Total External†	3	10	10	28	7	26

Note. Percent of types of lesson framing statements to total lessons. Percentages do not total 100, since more than one type of statement could be used in each lesson and only categories used 3 or more times by at least one teacher are listed.

*Mind, Fun, Choice, Purpose, Personal Relevance, Teacher Personalizes, Teacher Enthusiasm, Positive Expectations.

†Accountability, Demand, Threat, Rewards, Time Reminder, Challenge/Goal Setting.

Table 2

Number and Percent of Management/Maintenance Statements

	Teacher K		Teacher G		Teacher I	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Lessons	31		48		27	
Manage/Mainten. Statements	81		121		98	
Attend/Focus	10	12	0	0	0	0
Think/Challenge	29	36	1	1	2	2
Redirect Alone	2	3	32	26	6	6
Redirect w/Cause	13	16	44	36	12	12
Redirect Neg.	0	0	21	17	36	37
Threat/Punish	2	3	13	11	20	20
Pos. Exp/Encour.	5	6	0	0	1	1
Time Info/Plan	9	11	3	2	1	1
Hurries	0	0	1	1	8	8
Purpose	0	0	0	0	3	3
Effort	0	0	0	0	3	3
Teacher Feelings	3	4	1	1	1	1
Other	8	9	5	4	5	5
Total Positive*	43	53	6	5	9	9
Total Negative†	2	5	34	28	56	58

Note. Percent of types of statements to total number of management/maintenance statements. Only categories used 3 or more times by at at least one teacher are listed.

*Challenge/Think, Humor, Teacher Enthusiasm, Teacher Models, Purpose, Help, Time Information/Plan, Positive Expectations/Encouragement, Rewards, Student Interest, Task Difficulty.

†Redirect Negative and Threat to total number of redirection statements.